

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/672,050	09/29/2000	Scott L. Broutin	Broutin 31-35-50	2996	
24998	7590 04/02/20	04	EXAM	INER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L STREET NW			MONBLEAU,	MONBLEAU, DAVIENNE N	
	ON, DC 20037-152	6	ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2878		

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1/4
Advisory Action	09/672,050	BROUTIN ET AL.	4
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Davienne Monbleau	2878	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	, ,,,,,,,,
THE REPLY FILED 16 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice it is applicated and the same of this application and the same of the	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	ı ued
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	1
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set	e under forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifyi	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amend	iment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	y
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 11-20.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		/ 1/1/// -	
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	DAVID PORTA	
	SUP	ERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE	R
Danierre Monbleaux	T	ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the new issues are the backface monitor or said laser device the limitation that said feedback loop is operationally nested inside said tuning current loop and said tuning current is operationally nested inside said power control loop. These elements require further search and consideration.